



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

sake of his father, to the *il-ku a-na E-zi-da*. In Thompson, *Reports*, No. 240. rev. 4 (*il-ku it-ti-ni*), after killing two men, the murderers give as an excuse: "it was a corvée, with us" (Thompson: an edict). In Harper, *Letters*, 406, obv. 9, the proximity of *parši* (edict) would suggest the meaning proposed, with hesitation, by Delitzsch: "duty" (*AL*, 5th ed., p. 153), but the passage remains meaningless; while Jastrow (*Civilisation*, 492) renders "sacred service," a meaning for which we know no parallel.

Just as the institution of monarchy in Israel was at first considered a blessing, but later degenerated in a heavy burden for the people, so *ilku* was not, at first, tainted with those evils which made the very name an object of fear and aversion in later times.

ADDENDA

Harper, *Letters*, No. 99, quoted above, is discussed by A. T. Olmstead, *Western Asia in the Days of Sargon*, p. 32st.

Ilku in Harp. 219 and 406 (see above) probably means "religious service" as Jastrow renders in the second text and as Johnston (*JAOS*, XVIII, 175: "I pay heedful reverence to Ezida in thy behalf") does in the first. A parallel evolution in meaning is found in *dullu*, originally: toil, work (e.g., Harper, *Letters*, 290, rev. 14), then: religious cult (especially magical practices) (e.g., Harper, *Letters*, 1, obv. 14, rev. 9; 18, 5 and very often). The same change of meaning is not uncommon in modern languages (cf. our "service"; "Dienst," etc.).

Records of royal grants of lands and houses are found in the petitions for their restitution after having been unlawfully seized, as in Harp. 421, which is quite clear, and seemingly in Harp. 925, which is badly mutilated (obv. 8-10: "may the royal envoy come and see the field of my father which the King had transferred [to him]").

A "*bél ilki*" is mentioned in another fragmentary letter (Harper, *Letters*, 1273, 6), which seems to be an appeal to the king to decide between two contending parties claiming certain persons as their own (rev. 1, some one come saying "they are my people!"). Such disputes concerning rights over persons are referred to in Harper, *Letters*, 258 and 422 (cf. Winckler, *Allor. Forsch.*, II, 189 and 191). In Harper, *Letters*, 305, the king gives Ašipa the feudal jurisdiction over certain Nabatai. Disputes over territorial jurisdiction are found in *Letters*, 174 and 486.

ROBERT H. PFEIFFER, PH.D.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

נְקִיָּצָה וְנִבְקָעָה אֱלִינִי IN ISAIAH 7:6

The words נְקִיָּצָה וְנִבְקָעָה אֱלִינִי have always presented difficulties to translators. The LXX render them by συλλαλῆσαντες αὐτοῖς, ἀποστρέψωμεν αὐτοὺς πρὸς ἡμᾶς. Aquila translates נְבִקְעָה by ἀποσχίσωμεν αὐτήν,

Origen in the hexapla, *Et expugnemus eam*. The Peshitta has **ܬܚܒܝܢܐ** **ܫܠܬܝܢܐ**, *Let us break it up and break through it*. The Syriac hexaplar version follows the LXX; so does the Arabic version in the Paris polyglot. The Targum of Jonathan reads **וְנִשְׁוֹבְנָן עִמָּנָא** ¹ *Et iungamus et apponamus eos ad nos*. The Vulgate has *Suscitemus eum, et avellamus eum ad nos*. Luther renders the words by *Wir wollen . . . sie aufwecken und unter uns teilen*. The Authorised Version translates *Let us . . . vex it and let us make a breach therein for us*, while the marginal note gives the alternative *waken for vex*.

Modern commentators have tried to meet the difficulties in various ways. Gesenius, referring the suffix **נָה** to Jerusalem, has substituted **נְצִיִּקְנָה** for **נְקִיִּצְנָה**, and has translated *Laszt uns nach Juda ziehen, es [Jerusalem] einengen und uns oeffnen*. He is followed by Cheyne, Duhm, Marti, Gray, and others, though the latter properly understand **נָה** to go back to Judah. Lagarde has emended **נְקִיִּצְנָה** to **נְחִיצְנָה**. Delitzsch, Bredenkamp, Dillmann-Kittel, Hans Schmidt, Mitchell, Skinner, and Box retain the **נְקִיִּצְנָה** and translate it by *Laszt uns ihm Grauen einjagen*—*Let us terrify it*, or by some other phrase to that effect. As for **נְבַקְעָנָה**, all commentators take the Hiphil-form to mean *to split, to make a breach*, and refer it either to Jerusalem (Gesenius), or to the country at large, in the sense of *breaking it up, breaking it open, or forcing the passes* (Dillmann, Duhm, Marti, Hans Schmidt, Mitchell, Skinner, Cheyne, Box). The **אֵלֵינוּ** is rendered as a *dativus commodi, for or us*, or, what is similar to it, indicating direction, *to us, i.e., to bring it into our hands*.

After reading what the various commentators have to say in support of their translations, one cannot but feel a certain unsatisfactoriness about their renderings. In the first place, **נְקִיִּצְנָה** cannot well be changed to **נְצִיִּקְנָה**, since **הִצִּיק** is used only of putting a city into straits or of vexing it (Dillmann), or it is used of urging or coercing a person to do something, but would be inapplicable to a whole country, especially since it hardly was the *original* plan of Syria and Ephraim to wage heavy warfare against Judah, as would be implied in **נְצִיִּקְנָה**.

Furthermore, no matter how one phrases the idea of breaking into Judah and of breaking it up, which is said to lie in **נְבַקְעָנָה**, the **אֵלֵינוּ** makes the thought somewhat stiff; in fact, **אֵלֵינוּ** is not needed, since it is self-evident in whose interest the **נְבַקְעָנָה** is to be done. Besides, the thought of breaking into Judah is already expressed in **נַעֲלָה בִּיהוּדָה**, for **בִּ** **נַעֲלָה** *“implies actual entrance into the city or district concerned, not mere approach to it; cf. II Sam. 2:1; Judg. 1:3; I Chron. 14:11; II Chron. 21:17; Jer.*

¹ Thus Walton; Paris polyglot has **וְנִתְבַּרְנָן**, but translates “et iungamus.”

48:18" (Gray); so that there is no fitting progress of thought, if, after entrance into Judah, the country is to be put into straits and then, as one of the last acts, the passes are to be forced. A study of all the passages where **בָּקַע** is used in reference to places reveals the fact that this word occurs in four different constructions: (1) with a direct object, II Chron. 21:17: **וַיַּעַל בִּיהוּדָה וַיִּבְקַעֶיהָ**, where **בָּקַע** is best translated by "shattering, overwhelming," cf. II Chron. 25:12 where the passive is used of persons; (2) in the passive construction, Jer. 52:7 and II Kings 25:4: **וַתִּבְקַע הָעִיר**; Jer. 39:2: **הַבְּקָעָה הָעִיר**; Ezek. 30:16: **וְנָתַתְּ חֲדָיָה לְהִבְקָע**; (3) without a direct object, but with a preposition giving the direction of the *splitting*, II Sam. 23:16 and I Chron. 11:18: **וַיִּבְקַעֵי . . . בַּמַּחְנֶה פְּלִשְׁתִּים**; II Kings 3:26: **וַיִּקָּח [מִלֶּךְ מוֹאָב] אוֹתוֹ שְׁבַע מֵאוֹת אִישׁ שִׁלְחָה הָרֶב**; (4) with a direct object *plus* a preposition indicating the direction. Thus Isa. 7:6 and II Chron. 32:1: **וַיֹּאמֶר [סְנַחֲרִיב] לְבָקַעַם אֱלִיר**.

In the foregoing passages, except the last two, the LXX, the Peshitta, the Vulgate, and the Targum fairly agree. But in Isa. 7:6 the LXX and the Targum, and in II Chron. 32:1 the Peshitta, offer a translation all of their own. It is therefore these two cases which are of prime importance here. The LXX translate the phrase **נִבְקַעְנָה אֱלִינוּ** in Isa. 7:6 by *ἀποστρέψωμεν αὐτοὺς πρὸς ἡμᾶς*, but render **לְבָקַעַם אֱלִיר** in II Chron. 32:1 by *προκαταλαβέσθαι αὐτὰς*. The Syriac version translates **נִבְקַעְנָה** by **ܢܠܚܝܡ**, *Let us break through it*, but renders the words in II Chron. 32:1 by **ܐܠܝܢܐ ܕܡܝܡܢܐ ܕܡܝܡܢܐ ܕܡܝܡܢܐ** [**ܐܠܝܢܐ ܕܡܝܡܢܐ ܕܡܝܡܢܐ**], *Suscipite dextram et venite ad me* (Paris polyglott). The Targum reproduces **נִבְקַעְנָה** by **נְהַפְרִינוּ** **וְנִשְׁוֹנוּ** **עִמָּנָא** *iungamus et apponamus eos ad nos*.

Since the LXX, the Peshitta, and the Targum translate the phrase **בָּקַע**+object+preposition in a similar manner, though not in corresponding passages, the question is raised whether **בָּקַע** with direct object plus a preposition may not mean *to go over* (i.e., *to split*; cf. the German idiom *sich zu jemand schlagen*) *to another's side, to side with him*, and, if under pressure, *to yield to him*, while the Hiphil would express the idea of causing some one to do this. If this rendering be adopted the verbs in Isa. 7:6 present a fine progression of thought: *Let us go up into Judah and let us cower it and let us cause it to yield to us, etc.* II. Chron. 32:1 would then mean, *Sennacherib gave orders regarding their yielding* (i.e., that they should yield) *to him*.

But not only the succession of verbs in Isa. 7:6 requires some such progression of thought, the method of ancient oriental warfare also demands it. Sennacherib's invasion of Judah (II Kings 18 and 19; II Chron. 32) illustrates

just such tactics as Syria and Ephraim had planned to employ against Judah. The speech of the rab šākū (II Kings 18:19 ff.; II Chron. 32:9 ff.) and the letter of Sennacherib (II Kings 19:9 ff.; II Chron. 32:17 ff.) are good examples of what the LXX call συλλαλεῖν αὐτοῖς and the Hebrew expresses by נִקְי־צַנְהָ; and the words “make peace (בְּרִיכָה) with me and come out to me” (II Kings 18:31) certainly present a striking parallel to both מַחֲכֵה מַחֲכֵה and ἀποστρέφωμεν αὐτοὺς πρὸς ἡμᾶς. Such procedure, too, is in perfect agreement with Syria’s and Ephraim’s aim to bring about an *alliance* of Judah with themselves. To gain this end Syria and Ephraim would scarcely have planned from the beginning to undertake heavy warfare against Judah, but they undoubtedly thought to gain all by a terrifying display of force. When that failed, hard warfare was, of course, necessary.

Finally, if the assumption of Duhm and Hans Schmidt, that Tābēl was a Jew who had possibly been banished by Ahaz, or by his predecessor, and who had a considerable following in Judah, has any foundation in history, then the use of נִבְקַעְנָה אֵלֵינוּ, *Let us cause it to split toward us*, to express the idea of winning the favor of Tābēl’s party and of thus inciting fatal dissension, becomes at once clear. However, it is not necessary to assume this concerning Tābēl, since, as II Chron. 32:1 [סִנְהָרִיב] וַיֹּאמֶר לְבָקְעֵם אֵלֵינוּ and the entire Sennacherib episode show, the συλλαλεῖν αὐτοῖς was for the purpose of *arousing* in the people dissatisfaction with the policy of the ruler and of *creating* a party that would work into the hands of the enemy. In either case the idea of causing a split, in order to force the loyal party to yield, would be an exact description of the object in view, and we would have here another illustration of the principle: divide et impera.

ADOLPH BRUX

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE MODIUS

The revisers of the Bible very correctly, in Matt. 5:15, changed “under a bushel” of the King James Version to “under the bushel.” A clear mistranslation of the Greek had weakened the force of the passage unnecessarily; it is *the* bushel which every householder has as a part of the necessary equipment of the home.

It is interesting to know that this useful article still bears its ancient name in abbreviated form. The Roman *modius* was easily transferred to the Greek language as *μόδιος*, and thence made its way into Arabic by way of the Syriac (ܡܕܝܐ). It is known today in the Lebanon as the “mud” or “mid” (مِدْ) owing to varieties of pronunciation.